

**Washington County Land Use Authority Meeting
September 10, 2013**

The Washington County Land Use Authority Meeting was held Tuesday, September 10, 2013 in the Council Chambers of the Washington County Administration Building located at 197 E. Tabernacle, St. George, UT. The meeting was convened by Chairman Doug Wilson at 1:30 p.m. He led the Pledge of Allegiance, after which, he explained meeting protocol.

Commissioners present: Dave Everett, Kim Ford, Mike Stucki, Rick Jones, and Deborah Christopher.

Excused: JoAnn Balen and Julie Cropper.

Staff present: Scott Messel, Planning & Zoning Administrator; Eric Clarke, Deputy Attorney; Kurt Gardner, Building Official; Todd Edwards, County Engineer; Dean Cox, County Administrator; Doreen Bowers-Irons, Planning Secretary; and Kim Hafen, County Clerk.

Chairman Wilson stated it was brought to his attention that some misinformation had been given out regarding the Ordinance Amendment for Residential Treatment Centers. As the Washington County Planning Commission, we have no jurisdiction over St. George City and the proposed facility planned for the Bloomington Hills area. A woman in the audience commented that if the County approves something it would affect the city as well. Chairman Wilson stated that is not the case. He asked County Deputy Attorney Eric Clark, to respond to the concern. Mr. Clark explained the role of County, City, State and Federal Government and verified the proposed changes to the ordinance would not have an impact on the City of St. George. There were some comments from the audience regarding the drug and alcohol treatment center going into their neighborhood in St. George, which they do not want. Mr. Clark and Chairman Wilson stated what the planning commission does on this amendment will not effect what St. George does or does not do with regards to zoning.

Chairman Wilson stated they would move the meeting along and anyone who wished to speak on the ordinance amendments could do so during the public hearing for that item.

I. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT. Request for Gooseberry Mesa Yurts. Parcel 2163-C-NP-HV. Zoned OST-20; Gooseberry Mesa LLC/Kenny Jones, applicants.

Mr. Messel reported Gooseberry Mesa LLC, owners of parcel 2163-C-NP-HV, is requesting conditional use approval to erect up to 4 Yurts on their property. The yurts could then be rented on a daily/nightly basis. A Yurt is a portable structure much like those used by nomadic tribes in Mongolia over 2000 years ago. It is canvas or vinyl wrapped over a wood lattice frame. The domed, tent like structure sits on a wood deck... they are built to withstand 100 mph winds. The Washington County General Plan states, "Trails have become an important part of the exceptional quality of life and livability of Washington County and are a major draw for tourists and residents alike." The following is from the letter submitted with the application. "Overlooking Zion National Park and the Smithsonian Butte, Gooseberry Mesa has some of the best views of any mountain bike destination in the world. The 50 miles of single track located on top of, and below, the mesa have been featured in all the top mountain biking magazines." There are numerous yurts located throughout Utah and Colorado that provide a unique alternative to traditional camping or a hotel. The Utah Department of Natural Resources website has a page dedicated to yurt facilities in state parks <http://www.stateparks.utah.gov/acitivities/camping/yurts>. There are yurts in East Canyon State Park, Goblin Valley State Park, and Rockport State Park. The applicant states in the attached letter, "Our goal is to keep the area primitive and pristine while giving our guests a warm and dry stay. The Yurts will sleep up to 8 people on bunks and cots. Guests will provide their own solar showers, water, wood, food, and bedding or pay an additional fee for us to provide them. There will be no wood gathering on the mesa and we will have a strict pack it, in pack it out policy." A port-a-potty will be provided and service will be on an as needed basis. The applicants hope to build a permanent toilet facility in the future. There will be one yurt at first with the possible erection of up to four total yurts.

Recommendation:

Staff has reviewed and recommends the Planning Commission approve the conditional use for the Gooseberry Mesa Yurts based on the following findings and conditions:

1. The use is in harmony with the character and intent of the OST zone.
2. The use is in harmony with applicable elements of the General Plan.
3. The requested use would provide an approved lodging alternative for tourist, mountain bikers, and outdoor enthusiasts' to enjoy Washington County's trail and back country.
4. That any future restroom facility must be approved by Washington County Building Department, Ash Creek Special Service District, State of Utah DEQ and Southwest Utah Public Health Department.

Commissioner Everett asked if this would be considered a campground or rental unit. Mr. Messel answered it could be considered either one. It is similar to a campground. At this time, the way the ordinance is written, it does not call out campgrounds. We will discuss campgrounds during the ordinance amendment portion of the meeting.

The staff and commission discussed the category of rental sites versus camping units.

Commissioner Ford asked if a business license would be required. Mr. Messel answered it would be. Chairman Ford then suggested another condition should be added to require the business license be in place.

Kenny Jones representing Gooseberry Mesa Yurts explained the plan for the yurt campground they are proposing. He explained how the concept came about noting this is partnership of four people. They have 10 acres but will be utilizing less than 4 acres for the project. The majority of the land falls off of the Mesa. They want the campground area to remain small and would have no more than four yurts. They are trying to keep it as primitive as possible; basically, a little above tent camping. The yurts would be rented for one or two nights to individuals who are utilizing nearby trails for hiking or mountain biking. The area is remote and hard to get to. He indicated they will install a restroom facility in the future, until then they will be using port-a-potties. The people who will utilize the campground will provide their own solar showers, water, food, etc.

Chairman Wilson asked about the access. Mr. Jones answered the access would be from a county road.

Commissioner Ford asked about facilities that would be on site. Mr. Jones explained the yurts would contain a table, wood stove, and cots. There will not be other camping sites on the property outside the yurt.

A discussion on sizes of the proposed yurts; how the yurt is constructed, i.e. footings, decking, etc.; camping on the BLM property adjacent to this land; the availability of year round usage; emergency communication and services; and various other aspects of the project were discussed.

Commissioner Ford asked about meeting the building code for safety. Mr. Gardner answered they are a temporary structure and building codes would not apply.

A question was asked in regards to fencing the property and Mr. Jones answered no fencing will be installed around the property.

Commissioner Stucki asked if there are any yurts currently on the property. Mr. Jones stated there was. Mr. Stucki then asked if it was temporary or permanent. Mr. Jones stated yurts are temporary structures that could be taken down. It takes some work to erect and take down yurts. Mr. Jones explained how the yurts were constructed and set up.

A discussion regarding county liability occurred where Mr. Clark stated the government immunity act would apply.

Commissioner Everett stated his concerns of safety and emergency issues.

Kurt Gardner reported that in 2007, the County adopted the Urban Wildland Interface Code for structures in these types of areas. The structure itself will not meet the adopted code. There are concerns on having temporary structures and not meeting the Wildland Interface Code. Normally, a temporary structure is only allowed for 90 days. If we call this a temporary structure, then that means it is like a tent or similar to a circus tent, etc. Who knows how long this temporary structure will be in place. Even though the structure is considered temporary, it is being set-up as a permanent situation.

After additional discussion for clarifications, and other areas where yurts are in place, Commissioners Stucki and Christopher indicated they would like to see something like this happen. However, they would like more information to ensure this type of use would be regulated from the beginning. The commission would like to see this work but have concerns with safety issues.

Motion: Commissioner Everett MOVED to table approval of the conditional use permit request for Gooseberry Mesa Yurts. Parcel 2163-C-NP-HV. Zoned OST-20. Gooseberry Mesa LLC/Kenny Jones, applicants, until additional information on fire prevention, safety issues, and items discussed could be presented to the commission. Commissioner Christopher SECONDED. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

II. PUBLIC HEARING/ZONE CHANGE. Request to rezone a 1.21 acre portion of Parcel C-4-A-NW from A-20 (*Agricultural 20 acres*) zone to C-3 (*General Commercial*) zone; Matthew and Paige Gray, applicants.

Mr. Messel reported Matthew and Paige Gray are requesting to rezone a 1.21 acre portion of their property, which is parcel C-4-A-NW, from A-20 (*Agricultural 20 acres*) to C-3 (*General Commercial*). If the zone change is approved the applicants are planning on building storage rental units; which is a permitted use in the C-3 zone. Any proposal for the property would need to be reviewed and approved under Washington County's site plan requirements. Washington County Code 10-10-1-C states, "The objective of the C-3 General Commercial zone is to provide space within the county where nearly all types of commercial goods and services may be provided. Since the zone permits such a wide variety of uses, the protective features which zoning normally affords to adjacent properties are mostly nonexistent." The Washington County General Plan Map shows a circular graphic of commercial in proximity to this property. The General Plan states, "The outline of land use areas are, in some instances, definite and straight, and in other instances flexible and free form as shown on the map. A curving, or free from line, indicates a flexible boundary between two classes of land use. On the other hand, a straight definite line which is co-terminus with the edge of a well-defined physical boundary, such as a street, or other fixed an observable line, indicates a definite boundary for the district." It also states, "The General Plan is not a zoning plan. It should, however, bear a relationship to all future land use actions taken by the land use authority."

Considerations:

Staff has reviewed the proposal and recommends that the Planning Commission take the following into consideration:

1. Does the proposal meet the intent of the general plan?
2. Is the requested zone, C-3 (*General Commercial*), appropriate for this parcel?

Recommendation:

The Planning Commission can recommend approval based on the following findings:

1. The proposed zone change meets the intent of the general plan and general plan land use areas map.
2. Several adjacent and nearby parcels are zoned commercial (C-2).

3. The proposed zone is appropriate for this parcel.

Commissioner Stucki asked for clarification of the portion of the property being rezoned; if it was only a portion or the whole property. Mr. Messel stated it was 1.21 acres of property and not the whole piece. He pointed out the location of the proposed property being rezoned. The legal description of the property being rezoned has been submitted to the county. In the future, they will be able to subdivide the property off if they want to do so.

Commissioner Ford stated the area appears to be a drainage area. He was informed it was a wash. A short discussion regarding the wash took place.

Todd Edwards reported there is a wash on the property and the applicants will need to address that when they bring in the site plan and building permit application. Some questions and answers regarding the wash and how it would be maintained occurred.

Commissioner Christopher stated her concern is rezoning the property to a C-3, then the owner's sell it and something else goes in instead of the use that was approved by the commission.

The commission discussed at length the concerns Commissioner Christopher had regarding rezoning the property to the C-3 zone. Commissioner Stucki stated he was in favor of the rezone.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to open the public hearing. Commissioner Stucki MOVED to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Everett SECONDED. Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Matthew Gray reported he owns the property and the intent is to build a storage facility in phases as this land is not really farmable. He stated he felt there's a need for the storage units for the area and he would like to supply that service. The facility will be fenced and secured. He asked the commission to approve the rezone.

There were no other public comments.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to close the public hearing. Commissioner Stucki MOVED to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Everett SECONDED. Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Commissioner Everett commented if RV's are stored in the facility they should not be allowed to be lived in.

The commission discussed findings and conditions of approval for the rezone as follows:

1. The proposed zone change meets the intent of the General Plan.
2. Several adjacent and nearby parcels are zoned commercial.
3. The proposed C-3 rezone is appropriate for this parcel.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to approve the findings discussed. Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Motion: Commissioner Stucki MOVED to recommend the County Commission approve the rezone of a 1.21 acre portion of Parcel C-4-A-NW from A-20 (*Agricultural 20 acres*) zone to C-3 (*General Commercial*) zone; Matthew and Paige Gray, applicants based on the following findings:

1. The proposed zone change meets the intent of the General Plan.
2. Several adjacent and nearby parcels are zoned commercial.
3. The proposed C-3 rezone is appropriate for this parcel.

Commissioner Ford SECONDED. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with four (4) Commissioners voting in favor. Commissioner Everett voted Nay.

III. PUBLIC HEARING/ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS. Review of proposed changes to the Washington County Land Use Ordinances permitting campgrounds in additional zones; clarifying time limitations on conditional use permits; eliminating the requirements for a special permit for residential treatment facilities; making other clarifying changes; County initiated.

Mr. Clarke reviewed the proposed ordinance changes for campgrounds; conditional use permits time limitations and the time frame for abandonment; also, an ordinance regulating group homes. He reviewed each item individually.

The campground ordinance changes will provide a clear definition of campgrounds, which we do not have in the current zoning code. It includes campgrounds as a conditional use in open space zones, forest residential zones, and possibly in the larger agricultural zones.

Chairman Wilson asked if the yurts fall under this new ordinance or would they be grandfathered in before the ordinance takes place. Mr. Clarke stated they would fall under the ordinance that is in place at the time the applicant is submitted.

Mr. Messel stated there will be a requirement checklist provided to applicants when they apply for a conditional use permit for a campground. He explained some of the requirements being proposed.

Chairman Wilson read the campground definition out loud for information purposes.

A short discussion on campgrounds and the ordinance change took place.

Mr. Clarke reported on the conditional use permit time limitation ordinance amendments. The change would clarify the time limitation so that once a conditional use permit has been issued; if at the end of one year construction has not been started, the conditional use permit shall become null and void unless a request is made for an extension by the applicant. In granting any request for extensions, the planning commission shall find that substantial work had been accomplished toward completion; or through no fault of the applicant, it has been impossible to diligently pursue the completion. Extensions may be granted for periods of time not to exceed one year at each extension. Once completed, the permit shall require no further renewals unless stipulated by the planning commission. Also, an abandonment paragraph could be included that states if the use or activity ceases for a continuous period of time from one up to five years, which ever the commission is comfortable with, the conditional use permit shall automatically terminate as having been abandoned. A new conditional use permit would then be required prior to the continuance of the conditional use.

Mr. Clarke stated the change to the Washington County Code Title 10 Chapter 13, Section 21, regarding Residential Facilities for Persons with a Disability (group homes), is a result of a case that was heard in the Federal 10th Circuit Court regarding St. George versus Cinnamon Hills Crisis Center where, approximately one year ago, the court ruled against the city. He explained the court case in short detail. Based on the ruling, the county needs to update and strike some language in the ordinance in order to comply with the laws outlined by the courts. He explained the changes. They are not a conditional use because we are not allowed to impose additional requirements on someone because of a disability.

A discussion occurred regarding the changes to the ordinance and the court case decision. The commission asked for clarification on group homes and numbers of occupants which Mr. Clarke answered. Mr. Clarke reiterated these changes are based on case law and this is the position we are being advised to go to protect the county from potential lawsuits.

Motion: **Chairman Wilson called for a vote to open the public hearing. Commissioner Stucki MOVED to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Ford SECONDED. Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.**

Chairman Wilson explained the rules for the public hearing. He noted everyone who wished to speak will have three minutes and should keep their comments brief and to the point. He also asked that when they comment to be respectful. He reiterated that the county has no authority over the cities and whatever is taking place in the cities should be addressed with the city itself.

Caroline Bass of St. George reported on State Law requirements for rehabilitation type of facilities. Only one bathroom is required for 8 people. She understands States, Counties, and City's fear lawsuits that will cause the citizens millions of dollars; hence, the first to align with federal rule. She is opposed to this change making it easier for businesses to move in to residential areas setting up precedence and putting neighborhoods at risk. She asked the commission to not make the changes.

David Barker of St. George stated the comment was made that this has nothing to do with the city. However, referencing case law it will impact the cities.

Chairman Wilson reported the comment was: "We as the county has no jurisdiction over the city". Mr. Barker agreed that was the comment. However, the changes would impact others.

Mr. Baker stated a second point is that we keep giving people extra rights and you take away from someone else. The residents of Bloomington not only do not want a residential treatment center in Bloomington, they do not want one in any residential area. He voiced his opposition to the ordinance changes.

Man did not provide his name stated he retired from the Los Angeles Police Department and he opposes this change and residential treatment facilities in residential neighborhoods. This type of use will increase crime and increase public services. This use has no place in residential areas.

Nickie Stocks explained where her home is located and the proposed location of the treatment center reporting they back the Virgin River. She opposes the changes and the use in residential areas. She worked for Division of Child and Family Services and fears if this goes into their neighborhood it will go into any neighborhood. The County should be just as concerned with this use going into other residential areas throughout the county.

Ron Davis stated he lives near the facility and expressed his opposition to this use. He is tired of the representatives in office saying there is nothing we can do.

Dave Doddridge stated he also retired from the Los Angeles California Police Department and is opposed to allowing this use in residential areas. He asked for some legal clarification on what the cities and counties can do. The people who open these facilities don't care about the area; they just want to make money. Someone somewhere has to say no.

Elaine Tyler stated she read the proposed ordinance changes draft and had some concerns with two of the changes for disabilities, which personally she thought drug and alcohol addicts should not be considered "disabled". Those items in the draft are number 2, 3, and 5. She had family who were drug and alcohol addicts and believes that the types of persons who will be in the facility will be a direct threat to the health or safety of the neighborhood. She believed they would break into the clubhouse and destroy properties surrounding the facility. This facility will be located near two schools. She opposes this use and the change to the ordinance.

Dean Cox stated this is tough and takes courage. He commented on an article from the Wall Street Journal, which he read aloud, where Boise County, Idaho had to file bankruptcy due to the fact that they had a multi-

million dollar judgment against it after they lost in Federal Court a lawsuit, brought by a developer of a residential treatment facility that would have housed 72 boys, when that county placed restrictions on the developer. The developer sued under the fair housing act and won a four million dollar judgment and another four million in attorney fees. He stated the County has to live with the federal laws and mandates. He believed this to be a necessary change. He expressed empathy with the residents, although the County cannot ignore nor break the law.

Myna Young reported she is a recent resident in the neighborhood. She is also the daughter of a chemically dependent household. Her family members have been institutionalized, rehabilitation centers, jailed, and had every kind of treatment imaginable. The only time rehab worked for them was when it was in rural areas where they had no way to leave. She is in favor of the changes as this will be a help to people with dependency issues.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to close the public hearing. Commissioner Stucki **MOVED** to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Everett **SECONDED**. Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Motion: Commissioner Stucki **MOVED** to address approval of each item independently. Commissioner Christopher **SECONDED**. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

The commission discussed approval and made findings of facts for the campground ordinance as follows:

1. This provides a definition to campgrounds where one does not currently exist.
2. Clarifies ambiguity in the code.
3. Proper notice was given and a public hearing was held.
4. Identifies the zones in which camping is permitted or as a conditional use.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to approve the findings discussed. The Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Motion: Commissioner Stucki **MOVED** to recommend the County Commission approve the proposed changes to the Washington County Land Use Ordinances permitting campgrounds in additional zones; County initiated, based on the following findings of fact:

1. This provides a definition to campgrounds where one does not currently exist.
2. Clarifies ambiguity in the code.
3. Proper notice was given and a public hearing was held.
4. Identifies the zones in which camping is permitted or as a conditional use.

Commissioner Everett **SECONDED**. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

The commission discussed the changes and made findings of facts for time limitations on conditional use permits as follows:

1. Clarifies the code specifically the portion that states if construction has not been started within one year or other uses have been abandoned, the use the permit will become null and void.
2. Proper notice was given and a public hearing was held.
3. It fits with other language typically used by other counties and municipalities. It is a commonly followed standard.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to approve the findings discussed. The Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Motion: Commissioner Stucki MOVED to recommend the County Commission approve the proposed changes to the Washington County Land Use Ordinances clarifying time limitations on conditional use permits, County initiated, based on the following findings of fact:

1. Clarifies the code specifically the portion that states if construction has not been started within one year or other uses have been abandoned, the use the permit will become null and void.
2. Proper notice was given and a public hearing was held.
3. It fits with other language typically used by other counties and municipalities. It is a commonly followed standard.

Commissioner Everett SECONDED. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

The commission and staff discussed at length and clarified reasons for approval of the changes which came down to being based on case law and federal protection standards. Part of the discussion included finding reasonable accommodations and laws to allow treatment centers in residential areas.

Myna Young spoke on the difference between recreational drug users and people who are actually disabled by using chemical drugs or alcohol. Most of the people who go to treatment centers are recreational users but the centers do not distinguish between truly disabled addicts and recreational users. They only care about the money.

With an alcoholic and a drug addict there is a point in the recreational use of the chemical when you continue to use it, and use it, and use it, you are strictly a recreational user of the drug; you are not disabled. There is a specific thing in your brain that causes you to go from being a recreational user into a person who does not have the ability to make the choice to not use the drug. That can be proven. What happens in creating the disability is that people actually have what appear to be holes in the brain; these holes are oxygen deprived. When they are oxygen deprived they do not function. There is point in the center of the head when this picture that looks like holes start radiating out lines. At that point, you no longer have the ability to make the choice. Very few people have the test done to prove they are actually disabled. If a person who is actually disabled by the use of the chemical or alcohol, it is essential that they be locked up. Not locked up in jail but somewhere where they cannot get out because they have no control over it. It does not matter if you are chemically dependent or alcoholic dependent, the same thing happens. There are some drugs (which she could not say as she did not know) that immediately cause the effect and you are addicted and disabled and there are many you could use for years which would not cause the condition.

If a drug or alcohol rehabilitation center were to have to prove their people were disabled by doing the tests, that would make a huge difference in whether or not they choose to have those people. They're actually counting on the hundreds of people that they can get in their facilities who are recreational users of drugs so that they can get them back over and over again. My family has spent tens of thousands of dollars for more than 70 years rehabilitating people who did not want to be rehabilitated. Until a person wants to be rehabilitated, they won't do it. If the facility has to prove they are disabled first, before they accept them into a home anywhere, that would make a lot of difference in the number of people who get help being rehabilitated.

The commission discussed requiring the rehabilitation center give the tests and make the individual centers prove disabilities for a permit to operate the business.

Multiple comments came from the audience which the commissioners responded to.

The commission made findings of facts for eliminating the requirements for a special permit for residential treatment facilities ordinance as follows:

1. This is consistent with State and Federal Case Law.
2. The changes are being made on the advice of the County Attorney.

Motion: Chairman Wilson called for a vote to approve the findings discussed. The Motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

Ronald Damm, resident of Bloomington expressed his frustrations with nobody being able to do anything to help stop rehabilitation facilities going into residential areas and especially coming into his neighborhood in Bloomington. He spoke about his son who has an addiction to alcohol and the problems he has that others like him may bring into the neighborhood crime, drug addicts, prostitution, neighborhood destruction, etc.

Commissioner Christopher advised the audience to go to their lawmakers to make some changes.

Motion: Commissioner Stucki MOVED to recommend the County Commission approve the proposed changes to the Washington County Land Use Ordinances eliminating the requirements for a special permit for residential treatment facilities and making other clarifying changes, County initiated, based on the following findings of fact:

1. This is consistent with State and Federal Case Law.
2. The changes to the ordinance are being made on the advice of the County Attorney.

Commissioner Christopher SECONDED. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

IV. STAFF DECISIONS. The Land Use Authority Staff Meeting held on September 3, 2013.

Mr. Messel reported on the Land Use Authority Staff Meeting held on September 3, 2013, which included review of a Planning Commission Agenda Items, outstanding conditional uses, and other items in review.

V. MINUTES. Consider approval of the minutes of the regular planning commission meetings held on August 13, 2013.

Motion: Commissioner Everett MOVED to approve the Minutes of August 13, 2013 as written. Commissioner Stucki SECONDED. Chairman Wilson called for discussion on the motion. There being none he called for a vote. The motion carried with all five (5) Commissioners voting in favor.

VI. COUNTY COMMISSION ACTION REVIEW. Review of action taken by the County Commission on planning items; County initiated.

There were no items to review.

VII. COMMISSION & STAFF REPORTS. General reporting on various topics; County initiated.

There were no reports to be given.

Commissioner Ford moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:53 p.m.

Doreen Bowers-Irons, Planning Secretary

Approved: 10 December 2013